

Trade in America 16.

17

A
L E T T E R
T O

DR. S H E B E A R:

CONTAINING A
R E F U T A T I O N

O F H I S

ARGUMENTS CONCERNING THE BOSTON AND
QUEBEC ACTS OF PARLIAMENT:

A N D H I S

ASPERSIONS UPON THE MEMORY OF KING WIL-
LIAM, AND THE PROTESTANT DISSENTERS.

By HUGH BAILLIE, L. L. D

LATE JUDGE OF THE COURT OF ADMIRALTY IN
IRELAND.

L O N D O N:

PRINTED FOR J. DONALDSON, BOOKSELLER,
CORNER OF ARUNDEL STREET, No. 195.
IN THE STRAND.
MDCCLXXV.



A
L E T T E R.

T O

DR. S H E B E A R.

S I R,

I Have seen a pamphlet, lately wrote and published by you, entituled, *An Answer to the Queries contained in a Letter to Dr. Shebear, &c.* In the beginning of this pamphlet, you vindicate your character, from aspersions thrown out against you in the public papers—in this controverſy I have no concern: but afterwards, through the pamphlet, you throw groſs aspersions upon the memory of that great prince King William, who ſaved *Holland* from French ſlavery—who ſaved *Britain* from popery and ſlavery, and fixed the ſucceſſion of the preſent royal family; and who ſaved *Europe* from the univerſal monarchy of *France*. You likewiſe attack the *Proteſtant Diſſenters*, and particularly the *Preſbyterians*, as traitors to, and murderers of

B

their

their king, and enemies to their country; and endeavour to make the *Papists* and *Jesuits* much better entitled to protection of government than they are. You likewise approve of the late acts of parliament with regard to *Boston* and *Quebec*, as tending to the interest of the king and public. And, in several other particulars, you support things that, I hope to convince you, upon cool reflection, you ought to rectify.——In order to assist you to correct these mistakes, I submit to your consideration the following observations.

You affirm, that the late peace with France and Spain was a glorious one, and saved the nation from bankruptcy. To me it appears in a quite contrary light: we had ruined the naval power of France and Spain entirely: and I heard the late Lord Egmount say, when first lord of the Admiralty, that the ships of war taken from France and Spain, and in our possession, were more than sufficient to have beat all the fleet that remained in the possession of France and Spain. We were in possession of all the sugar islands of France, except Hispaniola, which lay at our mercy: and we were in possession of the Neutral Sugar Islands. We were likewise in possession of the port of Havannah, which
made

made us masters of the trade of Spain : and we were in the sole possession of the fishery of Newfoundland ; by these conquests we were masters of the sugar trade of Europe. By which, with the fisheries, in the opinion of the most knowing merchants in London, Great Britain must have made about five millions sterling profit yearly, and have added between 15 and 20,000 sailors to man our fleets, and taken so many from France ; which at the same time deprived them for ever of power to man their fleets against us. Being possessed of the principal source of the riches of France, viz. their sugar trade, by which they draw in immense wealth from the rest of Europe, and were enabled to man their fleet against us—our only enemy we have to fear,—and after expending above 80 millions of money, and sacrificing the lives of more than 200,000 of our best men, we give all back again to France and Spain, for a *Nothing*, but what was in our possession, and which a single squadron of our ships of war could have secured to us, against the combined force at sea of France and Spain. You will say, perhaps, that Port Mahon was given back to us by the peace. This is true, but that was in exchange for

for *Belisle*, which we were in possession of, and which commanded the trade of that part of France. Now, I submit to your consideration, whether our having the sole possession of the sugar trade of Europe, and the Newfoundland fishery, were objects worth our attention; and if, by keeping them, we were in danger of bankruptcy.

Perhaps you will say, our bankruptcy must have arisen from our continuing the war against France upon the continent—there you and I agree: but as it was folly to enter into that war, which cost this nation more than 30 millions of money, so it would have been madness to have continued the war there, where no possessions belonging to Great Britain were to defend. Nothing can defend the late peace, except saying, that we were obliged to defend the foreign dominions there: and was this principle to be maintained hereafter, Great Britain must be undone whenever France, or any other powerful prince upon the continent, has a mind to attack these dominions.

You next commend the Quebec act of parliament, both on account of the favourable treatment given by it to the *Roman Catholics*,
and

and because it gives power to government to attack our *Protestant* brethren in *America*, who you say are naturally regicides. As to this character, it is needless to confute it—upon cool reflection you will condemn yourself for using it. These people, who have been settled in that part of the world for about 200 years, have always shown themselves loyal subjects to their sovereigns, and promoters of the trade and interest of their mother country, and sincere friends to the Revolution, which you yourself approve of; and such sincere friends to the present royal family, that before the late acts of parliament, viz. the stamp act, and the acts passed last sessions of parliament, called the *Quebec* and *Boston* acts, I believe there was not a Jacobite upon the whole continent of *America*, who durst profess himself to be so; and if there are any since, these acts have given them birth. As to what you say of the *Quebec* act, of its putting power in the hands of government to attack our *protestant* brethren in *America*, it is saying no more than what the enemies of the present ministry have said was the intention of the act, viz. that French *papists* were to be employed to reform our *protestant* brethren. But the friends of the
 ministry

ministry have always denied this to be the intention of the act. If you mean to call the people of *New England* regicides, because they are descended from *presbyterians*, who you say murdered King Charles I. and were enemies to kingly government, I believe I shall be able to convince you, that the *presbyterians* in those days, had no hand in murdering the king, but that, on the contrary, they endeavoured to save him—were the people who restored his son Charles II.—had a principal hand in the Revolution; and have been the steady supporters of the present royal family.

You afterwards find fault with a member of the House of Commons, for speaking too favourably of the printers, who may print things not approved of by government. I submit to your cool reflection, if printers are to be reckoned equally guilty of being enemies to a ministry, as the authors who send these things to the press. These printers cannot be supposed to have any malevolence by what they print in the common course of business, and are equally ready to insert in their papers things for or against the minister, as they are paid for them. Besides, the liberty of the press has always been reckoned one
of

of our greatest blessings acquired by the Révolution. At *Athens*, in the time of *Socrates*, when the principles of liberty were well understood, as distinguished from licentiousness, the actions of the greatest men were not only exposed by writing, but by representations upon the stage: and *Socrates* approved of it, upon this foundation, that if they were guilty of unworthy actions, they ought to be exposed; and if they were not guilty of bad actions, it would not hurt their character having their actions exposed. *Augustus Cæsar*, even after he was emperor of *Rome*, discouraged prosecutions upon account of libels, on the same foundation: and we find these prosecutions only encouraged by bad princes, such as *Tiberius*, *Caligula*, *Nero*, *Domitian*, &c. and we may see from *Tacitus*, that the good princes, such as *Titus*, *Nerva*, *Trajan*, &c. discouraged such prosecutions, putting their trust in the goodness of their actions and intentions. There can be nothing more just than what the clerk of *Ephesus* said against the persecutions of the Apostles, recorded in the book of Acts, "If these men's doctrines, says he, are from God, your opposition to them is vain; and if they are not, they will come to nothing of themselves."

You

You next find fault with *Algernoon Sidney*, as a republican, an enemy to kings, &c.

As to his being a republican, it seems plain from the Grecian and Roman history, as well as that of the Republick of *Holland*, that much greater actions have been done, by the same people, under a republick, than were done by them under absolute kings. He has furnished us with the best principles of government we find in any author, which are confirmed by Mr. *Locke*; and as you approve of the Revolution, you approve of their principles, that all governments originate from the people, whether they delegate their power to one man, or 500; and that the foolish notion, propagated in the four reigns preceding the Revolution, of Passive Obedience and Non-resistance, and that kings derive their authority only from God, and are only accountable to him, is neither founded in reason nor common sense. By the happy Revolution, and the act of parliament establishing the succession in the present royal family, we have effectually got free of that idle dream first propagated by King James I.

As to *Algernoon Sidney's* being an enemy to bishops, I never enquired whether he was or not,

as

as I was equally pleased, whether a man preached in a white or black gown, or a cloak. I shall only add, that he was condemned to death for papers found in his closet, not proved to be his; and which papers contained the principles upon which our happy constitution is now founded.

You say *Algernoon Sydney* was a pensioner to *France*, from the testimony of *Barillon* the French ambassador. I won't take the French ambassador's word for this, as *Sydney* always acted against the interest of *France*, and was keen for King Charles II. his breaking with *France*, and supporting the Dutch against them.

You next say what I approve of, that by the true principles of government, the people ought first to apply to their representatives, to get justice done them by the minister of the crown; and if these representatives don't do their duty, then they have a right to apply for it themselves. We have, I think, the best model of government that ever existed; but our misfortune is, that luxury, venality, and dissipation, has taken place among all ranks of men, instead of public spirit, and love of their country: and when this is the case, no government can ensure our

C

happiness,

happinefs, without a reformation amongst individuals.

You fay, that by the Revolution we exhausted ourfelves only to fave *Holland*. Surely, Sir, you know too much of the history of Europe, not to know that the alliance, made by King William againft *France*, of which *Great Britain* made a part, was the only thing that did, or could fave *Europe* from being enslaved by *France*. Is it not evident, that if *France* had conquered *Holland*, they muft have conquered *Britain* next: for at the battle of *La Hogue* the French fleet was conquered with great difficulty by the united fleets of both *England* and *Holland*: fo that by faving *Holland* we were faved.

You next exprefs an abhorrence againft the Whigs, and yet a very great Whig yourfelf. You approve of the Revolution, and that the laft refort is in the people. So that I find it is with the word, and not with the thing, you are at war.

You next feem to approve of *general warrants*, which you fay took place under King William. It is very true, there have been general warrants iffued fome times, in cafes of abfolute neceffity, when the government was in danger; but they

they never were deem'd legal, till the seizure of Mr. *Wilkes* and others, when they were supported by money out of the Treasury, before the court of Common pleas; and if the illegality of them had not been confirmed by the Lord Chief Justice, now Lord *Cambden*, we had been greater slaves than the French. I was at *Paris* with the late Lord *Stairs*, when he was ambassador there, and very often had occasion to see *lettres de cachet*, against particular persons, for putting them into the *Bastile*, but never heard of a *general warrant* given to a messenger, for imprisoning any body and seizing their papers. By such a warrant a messenger might seize as many people as he pleased, and under pretence of his suspicion imprison their persons, and seize upon their papers; and by this means possess himself of, perhaps, some hundred thousand pounds of their property, without giving any security for restoring it. Besides the impossibility of proving what papers or cash he had seized, perhaps he was not worth 50 *l.* in the world.

You next say, that *Wilkes* was secluded the House of Commons for his personal faults.—The House of Commons have nothing to do with the personal faults, or the personal virtues,
of

of a man returned by the county as their member: the only question before the house of Commons is, whether is such a man returned member by the county.

King William, you say, called a Convention, and by them excluded King James from the throne, which was worse than excluding *John Wilkes* from the House of Commons. King William could do nothing but call a Convention, till he was king, as the writs for calling a parliament, can only be issued by a king.

You complain of the heavy debts contracted by Queen Anne's wars. The question is, was the war just and necessary. If it was in order to preserve us and *Europe* from being slaves to *France*, it was necessary, and had a good effect.

You next accuse King William of the massacre of *Glenco*. I had occasion to know the particulars of that story from Mr. *Stewart of Arpin*, an enemy to King William, and to whom that land belonged. He told me the inhabitants of that Glen were thieves and robbers; and that the King had summoned them to lay down their arms, and surrender themselves at *Inverary* against a certain day, under the pain of military execution. They having failed to surrender, one

Hamilton,

Hamilton, an officer in the garrison of *Fort William*, a man of a cruel temper, and having a quarrel with the possessor of the Glen, vassal to *Stewart of Appin*, he, under pretence of a warrant for military execution, committed that cruelty, and fled to *Ireland*. And Mr. *Stewart* told me, that nobody believed King William intended any such thing by the words *military execution*.

You next accuse King William of protecting *Titus Oates*; and, because he did it, you imagine he was the contriver of that plot. As this affair was quite dubious, King William might easily be made to believe he was innocent: and you may as well blame our present gracious sovereign, who you own to be the best of princes, for pardoning *Kennedy*, who killed the watchman, by being imposed upon in matter of fact.

You next alledge, that King William was guilty of cruelty in many respects, both as a general in the field, and in private life, he having a pleasure in shooting animals. By which observation you would insinuate, that every gentleman who shoots animals, for his diversion, is cruel; and of consequence all the sportsmen in the kingdom are by you reckoned cruel. And as to his being cruel in the field as a general, I
never

never heard of any instance of it, except by bravely fighting and killing as many of the enemies to his country as he could in battle.

Your antipathy against that great prince King William, is so great, that, without any proof, you accuse him of horrid crimes; and say, that *Jones*, found guilty of Sodomy, would not only have been pardoned by him, but pensioned. It is really amazing to see you endeavour to recommend yourself to the present royal family, by tearing to pieces both the publick and private character of that great man, who saved *Great Britain, Holland, Germany*, and indeed all *Europe*, from slavery; who fixed the succession to the crown of *Britain* in the present royal family, to whom you own yourself greatly obliged, and seem to admire the many virtues of our present sovereign.

You say, King William broke his faith to the protestants of France, by making peace with France, without restoring them to the full exercise of their religion. Every body knows that he did all he could, to bring France to reasonable terms, but the Tories, in the English parliament, raised so many difficulties in supplying him with money, that he was obliged to make
peace

peace on terms he did not approve of: besides, his health declined so much, before the year 1697, when that peace was made, that he was not able to go to the army in person.

You say, King William sacrificed the *Scotch Darien* Company, to serve the interest of *Holland*. Here you are greatly mistaken in fact, for he did this at the desire of the ministry in *England*, who were jealous of that settlement hurting theirs; whereas the Dutch had no settlements of consequence in that part of the world.

You say, King William threw away much of his revenue to those who favoured him in a particular vice, you don't name. Is this worthy of your pen, when speaking of a great prince, without any proof, but your own imagination.

You say next, that all pensioners and placemen should be admitted into parliament, as all men are equally liable to corruption. This argument of yours is founded on supposition, that there is no such thing as an honest man, who will not betray his country in parliament; but I hope in God you are mistaken; although indeed I have seen things done by this last parliament, that I thought no House of Commons could be persuaded to do—— both against the
interest

interest of his Majesty, and the public interest of this country.

You next make corruption take its rise in 1688, so glad you are to make King William the author of every mischief, that happens to this country; at the same time, you own him to be the saviour of this country, from popery and slavery, by owning the Revolution to be necessary. Surely, Sir, you have read of parliaments in King Charles II's. time, so remarkable for being bribed and pensioned, that they had the nickname given them, of the *pension parliament*.

You next observe, that the coinage in King William's time, cost the nation a great sum of money, and the coinage now costs but a trifle. Pray, Sir, is this any reflection upon King William, as you seem to intend it, that the coin in the nation in his time, suffered more by clipping, &c. than it has done of late.

You next observe that Queen Anne, when princess, was under disgrace with King William, because she desired her revenue to be fixed. This is a private story, not mentioned in history, so far as I know, and is only mentioned by the Dutchess of *Marlborough*, who on all occasions vented her spleen against King William, as
he

he hated her for being the betrayer of the secret which lost him *Dunkirk*. And here I cannot but remark, that you seem to indulge your spleen against that great prince, by calling him, in this place, simply by the name of a *Dutchman*.

You next observe, that great complaints have been made against the parliament for taxing *America*, contrary to the charters granted to them by the king; and you say the king can't take away parliamentary rights. In this case you will be pleased to observe, that the predecessors of the present inhabitants of *America* were encouraged to make settlements there, under the promise of these charters they now enjoy. All land is supposed to be in the crown that is not given away. When the crown granted these charters, they were known to the parliament, and granted by advice of the privy council. These first planters ventured to make their settlements at the hazard of their lives and fortunes, and when there were many chances against their enterprise: but by their success, they have so effectually served their mother country, that except we destroy the prospect before us, we must be made by them the greatest nation in *Europe*. If they had no charters, it would be clearly our in-

D

terest

terest to give them the charters they are now in possession of, as by liberty alone any people can be great. And would it be consistent with either the glory or interest of *Great Britain*, to act in direct opposition to these charters, and fly in the face of their rights and privileges, granted to them by these charters, which the late acts of parliament seem to do.

I have been told, by those intimate with Sir *Robert Walpole*, that the same scheme for taxing *America*, was proposed to him; but he answered, that the right way to tax *America*, was to give them all encouragement, by which their numbers would be encreased, and by that the demand for our manufactures would encrease, and they would pay, as the last buyers, the taxes upon these goods; which would be ten times more profit to this nation than by taxing them. Besides, our taxing them would lose their affections, which must make them less useful to us, in case of a war with *France* or *Spain*. And here I must observe to you, Sir, that our American subjects, and particularly the town of *Boston*, who are now treated by us as enemies, were the most forward in venturing their lives and fortunes, in the service of their mother country, against the French;

French; and particularly, without our assistance, they took *Cape Breton*. Our parliament were so sensible of their having exerted themselves beyond their strength in our service, that they returned them their thanks, and paid them back a considerable part of the money which they had expended in the service of their mother country. And both king and parliament homologated their rights granted by charter, by applying to them to raise money and men for the service of this country, when we were at war with *France*. I shall only observe to you, that the number of inhabitants of North America, is now about four millions of people; and the men trained to the exercise of arms, about six hundred thousand: and it is calculated, that every twenty years the inhabitants double in number: so that in less than one hundred years, there will be more inhabitants in *North America*, than there is in *France, Germany, Holland, and Great Britain*, by which we should be made the greatest nation in *Europe*, by preserving their affections, which are strong towards their mother country. Besides, the act of navigation gives us a power over their trade: but, unluckily for us, a party in power have imagined, that by encouraging

couraging them, as our fathers have done for about 200 years, we may lose their subjection to us; which, by the bye, we never can keep, except by using them well, and making it their interest to be subservient to us. In short, our conduct of late, with regard to *America*, puts me in mind of the man, who in a storm, for fear of being drowned, threw himself into the sea,

Allow me, Sir, to lay before you some of the advantages we do and may receive by a good correspondence with *America*, in giving them the same treatment they have received for near 200 years, and are entitled to by their charters. We have paid, to the northern powers of Europe, from 1,500,000*l.* to two millions yearly, for naval stores, such as *timber, iron, hemp, tar, &c.* of late we have got much of these commodities from *America*; and in a few years, we will have no occasion to send any money to these northern powers, for these commodities, but may have them all from our own settlements in *America*, in exchange for our manufactures: by which we not only save the said two millions yearly, but likewise shall maintain thousands of manufacturers, who otherwise must starve or go abroad to other countries.—— Our settlements
there

there are likewise so extensive, and in so many different climates, that we can have, after that country is better peopled, *raw silk, wine, fruit, &c.* from our own colonies, which luxuries cost us, yearly, as much to foreign countries, as our naval stores did before we had any from *America*. Now, Sir, consider, if we lose *America*, with all these advantages, because they don't chuse to pay us a tax of three pence a pound upon *tea*, which perhaps may raise a few thousand pounds, do we act wisely or foolishly? besides, by losing the affections of our brethren there, we lose their assistance against our common enemy the French,

You next say, that because a great number of the inhabitants of *Britain* are not represented in parliament by their own choice, therefore they have the same right to object to being taxed by parliament that the Americans have. Surely, Sir, you must be sensible, there is no comparison between the two. In *England* there has been a constitution established for many hundreds of years, by which it has been fixed who shall, and who shall not, vote in the choice of members of parliament, against which no kind of people have objected: so that either tacitly, or expressly, every body have submitted to this constitution.

tion. The *Americans* are in a quite different situation—are 3000 miles distant from this country, and had a constitution established by charter, by which they tax themselves; and which no British minister ever attempted to infringe till lately.

You say we have expended great sums, in the defence of the *Americans* against the French; and in return they refuse to submit to our parliament. Surely, Sir, no man of understanding imagines we would have expended these sums, unless we had been convinced, that the preservation of *America* increased our trade, and took off our manufactures. And, had we allowed *France* to conquer *America*, we should have lost the greatest branch of our trade, and our greatest nursery for sailors, and exposed ourselves to be conquered by the French. Whereas, by preserving our colonies there, and the affections of the inhabitants, we must become the greatest nation in Europe. The *Americans* have never refused to assist us against our enemies, to the utmost of their abilities, and indeed beyond them, by which they are now considerably in debt.

You

You say there has been nothing done to *Boston*, but what they deserved, by their sinking the *tea*, and destroying British property.

The *tea* was destroyed by a mob of people not inhabitants of the town of *Boston*. Their agents here applied to parliament to be heard by council, to shew that the town had no hand in it; and their application was rejected. When a mob at *Glasgow* pulled down the house of their member of parliament, during Sir *Robert Walpole's* administration, the town was obliged to refund his damages, but not till after they were heard by council; and the House of Commons gave it as their opinion, that the magistrates were to blame. Had the House of Commons, in the case of *Boston*, heard council for the *Bostonians*; and after that been of opinion, the magistrates were to blame, there might have been a pretence for making the town pay the damage sustained by sinking the *tea*: but to block up the town—to deprive them of trade, and to take away the charter privileges of the whole province, is what cannot be defended from any principle in reason, in the law of nations, or any other law whatever that I know. It is the same as if a mob in *London* should break a parcel of
 glass

glass windows, or otherways destroy private property, and the parliament should make an act to block up the port of *London*, destroy its trade, and infringe its charter.

As to the *Quebec* act, you seem to think it grants no more than a toleration to *Roman Catholics*. But you will find it is an establishment of that religion: for the clergy, by that act, have the same power to demand their tithes, or other emoluments, as they could do under the French government: and a toleration gives nowhere a power to clergy, not in the established church, to demand the legal emoluments fixed for the clergy. It is no argument to say, the *papists* are more numerous there than the *protestants*; for in *Ireland* they were a hundred to one to the *protestants*, when the *protestants* were declared the established church, and had the legal emoluments; and the *papists* maintained their own clergy, as other dissenters do.

As to the government established there by that act, it is entirely arbitrary, and has not the look of a government established by the king of a free people: for the king names what council he pleases—turns them out when he pleases; and this is called the legislative power:

fo

so that the people there have no power, and therefore that province never can thrive—without liberty, and security of property, it is impossible any people can be happy, and without that nobody would choose to settle anywhere.

You say King William encroached upon the church of *England*, by endeavouring to take away the sacramental test.

I have heard the sensible and sober people of the church of *England*, complain of that test as well as the dissenters. Indeed it is shameful, that the sacrament of the Lord's supper should be used as the instrument to entitle a man to employment: so that if a man was ever so wicked, when he gets an employment, that obliges him to take the sacrament—the clergyman he applies to, *must* give it him.

You say, of late, our trade is greatly encreased. On the contrary, all the trading men I converse with, affirm it is greatly diminished: and that, particularly, the trade to *Portugal*, which formerly yielded us a million sterling yearly of balance, does not now yield a tenth part of that sum—the king of *Portugal* showing no regard to the treaties between the two nations. Pray, Sir, don't you think, that a squadron of men of war

E

had

had been better employed, to oblige the king of *Portugal* to observe treaties, than to employ them in ruining the trade of our colonies, and our own. Our trade to *Turkey* is equally sunk as that of *Portugal*.

You say King William's expence was five millions a year ; and that he threw away the blood and treasure of this nation to serve the Dutch.

You seem so fond of reflecting upon King William, in preferring the Dutch to *Great Britain*, that you have repeated it three or four times before—and I refer you to my answer to it. As to his expence being five millions a year, tho', you say, he was always beat—pray, Sir, was it a fault in King William, that the French king was so powerful, that both *England* and *Holland* were put to immense expence to prevent his enslaving them and all *Europe*. And as to his being always beat—nobody I ever heard of, blamed him for it : it was owing to two reasons, first, The troops he raised in *Britain* were raw and unexperienced men, and the troops of *France* were veterans, flusht with victory. Secondly, He was obliged sometimes to take Tories into his administration, who never served him with sincerity—and the House of Commons did not support

support him with that vigour which they afterwards did the Duke of *Marlborough*. I heard a great man, well acquainted with the Duke of *Marlborough*, say, that on the duke's being complimented on his great success against *France*, he answered, that he believed, if King William had been as vigorously supported, by the House of Commons as he had been, he would have done greater things than he did.

You say King William made a scandalous peace—I suppose you mean that of *Nemiguen*.

I find you are determined never to be pleased with King William—if he ventures his life in war against *France*, you say he ruins the nation by expence; and if he relieves the nation from that expence, you are equally displeased with him.

You say that King William occasioned the murder of *De Wit*, tho' he advanced him to the highest offices—and in this he was seconded by the Calvinist ministers.

I can see no foundation for this aspersión. From the best historians it appears, that the people of *Holland*, observing the great success of the French against them, when under the management of *De Wit*, they suspected him to be treacherous—

treacherous—and as they owed their liberties to the Prince of *Orange's* predecessors, *William* and *Maurice*, they insisted on his being made Stadtholder, to which *De Wit* did not incline, which occasioned his death. I shall not take upon me to say *De Wit* was in the interest of *France*, against his country, but his conduct looks very suspicious from some letters between the French ambassador at the *Hague*, and the French ministry, sometime before his death. As to the Calvinist ministers having any hand in *De Wit's* death, I never heard it affirmed before. But that they were sincere friends to the Prince of *Orange*, and thought it necessary to make him Stadtholder, to save the state, is true; and *De Wit* always opposed this measure, as contrary to his interest, he having then absolute power in the management of affairs in *Holland*.

You say King William was cruel because he beheaded a man for deserting a fort, in which he commanded, and which he thought was not tenable.

This is a very extraordinary accusation, as by the military law that punishment was just, and indeed necessary; for if military inferior officers shall take upon them to desert their post when
they

they think proper, no general can be sure of any thing. And you well know, that amongst the Romans, there are instances where consuls, and other commanding officers, have executed their own sons, not only for acting against orders, but even without orders, tho' they were successful. But it seems a rule with you, that King William must always be in the wrong.

You say the king of France saved *Holland* from being subjected to King William's power.

Of all the extraordinary things advanced by you, this seems to be the most extraordinary, and the first time I ever saw it affirmed, that the king of France had any other view in invading *Holland*, or any other country, but to satisfy his own ambition. It is a fact, affirmed by several historians, that after he had conquered one half of the Seven Provinces, he offered the sovereignty of them to King William, then Prince of *Orange*, if he would hold them of him, as overlord. That King William, by his bravery and conduct, saved *Holland* from French slavery, is universally acknowledged—but that the king of France saved *Holland* from being enslaved by him, is to me quite a new piece of history.

You

You say the king of France never wished to assassinate King William, because he was a bad general, and always beat. If this was true, how do you account for the following fact, affirmed by the historians of those times—the Duke of Berwick, at the head of about sixty men, who had taken the sacrament to kill King William at the battle of *Landan*, by pretending to be Englishmen, were all cut to pieces, except the duke, on their mixing amongst his troops with that intention. As for his being a bad general, I submit it to you, whether you or the great Prince of *Conde*, who commanded against him at the battle of *Seneff*, are the best judges. It is recorded by the best historians of that time, that the king of France, after that campaign, asked the Prince of *Conde*, what his opinion was of his cousin the Prince of *Orange*——he answered, If the fire of youth was over, and he was beat two or three times, and made more cautious by experience, he would make one of the greatest generals in Europe. *Voltaire* gives the same account of King William.

You repeat again what you said before, that King William was the author of *Oates's* plot—that he was both cruel in peace and war, and
delighted

delighted in killing animals——For this I refer you to the answer I have already given.

You say Queen Mary had no uneasiness on taking possession of her father's palace.

How you can judge of Queen Mary's feelings, I don't understand: but if she thought her father's intention was to ruin the liberties and religion of her native country, and to introduce popery and slavery, I think it must give her pleasure to find that it was in her husband's power to save her native country from ruin.

You next say, the Revolution was necessary to protect the religion and constitution of the nation. If you think so, I wonder you should tear to pieces the character of that great prince who brought it about. Do you say this in compliment to his present Majesty, whose family owes the crown they possess to that great prince King William?—for you own you are indebted to the king.

You observe, that the popish clergy often opposed the incroachments of the *Pope* on the liberties of *England*. I shall only observe upon this, that here, and elsewhere, you take notice of several good things done by the *papists*—but in your whole book you don't take notice of one single

single good thing done by the *presbyterians* or *protestant dissenters*—tho' I hope to be able to shew, in a proper place, that the royal family owes more to them than to any set of people whatever. But perhaps you will say, that the infallible church of *Rome*, have the same hatred to the presbyterians and protestant dissenters that you have, and therefore you must be right—and if you can prove that infallibility, you are in the right.

You say, that presbyterian principles lead to persecution; and that *Hudibras* makes it appear, that they are a perjured set of people. I thought I knew the principles of the presbyterians, and always thought them a different kind of people from what that merry gentleman, *Hudibras*, represents them——but at the same time own his authority to be as good as that of the infallible church just mentioned.

You say King James I. always represented the presbyterians as worse than thieves and robbers; and recommended to his son, Charles I. to keep them under.

King James's authority has no great weight with me, as I always thought him fitter for a schoolmaster than a king. When he speaks of
kings,

kings, he mentions them as kinds of gods, and as beings only accountable for their conduct to God—having their creation only from him, and not from the people. By these ridiculous notions, he was the real cause of all the misfortunes that happened to his son Charles I. The Presbyterians did not flatter him in these foolish opinions, and therefore incurred his displeasure: and by these opinions of his, his son and grand-child were ruined.

Next, you seem to maintain an extraordinary opinion, viz. That the gun-powder plot was contrived by the Protestants about the king; and that few Papists being concerned in it, shews it was not universally approved of by them. Surely, Sir, secrecy is necessary to carry on any plot; and in such a hellish contrivance, which the devil himself could scarce approve of, it was no wonder, that all popish powers abroad should disapprove of it when it did not take effect. The contrivers and executors of it, appear so plainly to be only *Roman Catholics*, and that there intention was to murder both king and parliament, that no mathematical demonstration is clearer: I refer the reader to the authentic accounts published of it. And as to the excuse

F

you

you make for *Garnet* the Jesuit, his not divulging it, because it was contrary to the rules of his order——any order of men, who could be capable of making such a rule, for concealing such a villainy, and every man capable to obey such an order, are unfit for human society, and ought to be hunted down as wild beasts and monsters.

You say that Lord *Stafford* and Archbishop *Laud*, the chief supporters of the church and state, were murdered by the Presbyterians.

The House of Commons were made up of many members not Presbyterians: and I own my Lord *Stafford's* case was hard, tho' I think he did many unjustifiable things. But as to *Laud*, he was a cruel persecutor, and most inhumane to all who differed from him in opinion, and had the greatest hand in the king's destruction, by being his chief adviser in all the arbitrary measures he followed.

You next impeach the House of Commons of a crime in demanding a dismissal of the king's ministers. I think in that they did their duty: and it must always be the duty of the representatives of a free people, to do all in their power to remove bad ministers from about the throne,
who

who they think are endeavouring to ruin the publick. You seem here to have forgot your own whiggish principle, that the people, when they apprehend themselves injured by the king and his ministers, should first apply to their representatives to have justice done them; and if they neglect to do their duty, the people have a right to do justice to themselves.

As to the execution of popish priests, by the House of Commons in Charles the first's time, purely for exercising their religion—I don't justify any persecution merely on account of religion: but as Papists have always been persecutors to all Protestants, it is no wonder Protestants are upon their guard against them; and I don't remember that any popish priest suffered by that House of Commons, except for crimes against the law, and which they knew to be so.

You next say the Presbyterians, when in power, persecuted the Episcopal, Arminians, &c. — You might have said the Episcopal did the same thing. I shall make no other observation on what you have said, but to set down part of a sermon by bishop *Hutchinson*, bishop of *Down* in *Ireland*: “ We were hard, said he, upon the Presbyterians and sectaries in Queen Elizabeth

“ Elizabeth and King James the first’s time,
 “ and they repaid us in our own coin in King
 “ Charles the first and *Oliver Cromwell’s* time :
 “ for persecution, like the bite of a mad dog, is
 “ infectious : but now, blessed be God, since
 “ the Revolution, Episcopal and Presbyterians
 “ live all peaceably together, as brethren and
 “ Protestants ought to do : and I hope in God
 “ we shall always continue to do so, and never
 “ hereafter persecute one another, as we have
 “ formerly done ; but leave persecution to the
 “ Papists, who have always practised it against
 “ people who differed from them, directly a-
 “ gainst the peaceable doctrines of our Sa-
 “ viour.”

You say the war against King Charles I. was
 infernal.——This seems to be against your
 own opinion, that the representatives of a free
 people ought to redress their grievances by the
 king and his ministers : and I think it is evi-
 dent, that if that House of Commons had not
 exerted themselves against the arbitrary proceed-
 ings of that prince, the nation must have been
 enslaved by him : but as that house never in-
 tended more than to redress grievances, what
 happened afterwards to the king, and was done
 by

by *Oliver Cromwell*, the parliament nor nation had no concern in; and I disapprove of it as much as you.

You say next, that the king took sanctuary in the Scotch army, who sold him for 400,000 *l*. When you consider the history of those times, you will be sensible this is a calumny against the Scotch: the fact is this: the parliament of Scotland and England made an alliance to defend their liberties against the King; and in consequence of this, a numerous Scotch army went into England, and joined the army of the parliament: and as the kingdom of Scotland could not easily support so great an army, the parliament of England agreed to pay them a monthly subsidy. When the king surrendered himself to the Scotch army, the commissioners from the parliaments of England and Scotland, who attended the army, met, and the king had it in his choice to go where he pleased; and he accordingly went to a place called, I think, *Humby House*: and as the war was reckoned now to be over, the English commissioners agreed to pay the Scots the arrears that were owing to them, and no more. This being the fact, in what were the Scots to blame? Could they have hindered the
king

king from following his own choice to stay in England? and was not this, in appearance, the best way for him? Could they foresee, that the officers of the army, without any authority from parliament, would possess themselves of the king's person by force.

You say next, that the king only continued a tax by his own authority, which had been yearly granted him by the parliament before, viz. tonnage and poundage.

The parliament, just now, grant yearly the land tax and malt tax: And would it be consistent with the constitution, that the king should raise these taxes without the consent of parliament?

The next thing you say, is, that you advise the church of England to consider, whether they are most in danger from the principles of Presbyterians or the Papists. After this advice of yours, I need not ask you what religion you are of; as no Protestant, I think, of any denomination, would have given such advice. Surely, Sir, you must have read the thirty nine articles of the church of England, and there you will find, by comparing them with the Confession of Faith of the church of Scotland, no difference, except

except in two things, viz. a few ceremonies of the church of England; and in this, that a bishop in the church of England has the direction of ecclesiastical affairs in a whole province, and every minister of a parish in Scotland, is bishop, or *episcopus* in his own parish. Is there then any comparison between the church of Scotland and that of Rome? and is not the difference between the church of Rome from both evident. I shall not go minutely into the principles of the church of Rome, in which they differ from both these churches; altho' their principles appear to me, in many particulars, both against reason and scripture. There is one principle, which makes it dangerous for Protestants, of all denominations, to put themselves in their power, viz. they maintain their church to be infallible, and upon that principle persecute all who differ from them; and don't think themselves obliged to keep their faith with hereticks, and deem it their duty to destroy them. I know the Roman Catholicks are at great pains to perswade the world, that these things are not true; but I have read both the acts of their councils, and the history of their practice, and think I can demonstrate from both, by the councils of *Con-*
stance,

stance, *Lateran*, and *Trent*, and in several others, these principles are established. I shall only give two or three instances of their practice in those principles : The emperor of Germany, by the consent of the council of *Constance*, had given a safe conduct for *John Huss* and *Jerom of Prague*, to attend the council, to answer some questions concerning their faith ; and when they came, they absolved the emperor from his engagement, and declared that neither he nor they were bound to keep their faith to hereticks——in consequence of this they were both burnt alive. The second example I shall give, is what happened to the Protestants in the kingdom of *France*. The king by the advice of the Pope, pretended to wish to have all differences between the Catholics and Protestants taken away ; and proposed to Admiral *Coligny*, the general of the protestant army, to marry his own sister to the King of *Navarre*, the head of the Protestants. In consequence of this, a safe conduct was given for all the Protestants to come to *Paris*, and be present at the wedding, under the broad seal of *France*, and confirmed with a solemn oath by the king. The Admiral, and many thousand protestant gentlemen, came to
Paris,

Paris, and there was 7000 of them had their throats cut in their beds, mostly gentlemen; and the king himself stood at a window, and as some gentlemen were endeavouring to make their escape, fired guns at them. At the same time, expresses were sent through all *France*, ordering a massacre of the Protestants, by which one hundred thousand of them were murdered. All this was approved of by the Pope, as worthy of the first son of the church, upon these two principles, that hereticks were to be destroyed, and no faith was to be kept with them. I don't desire you to believe Protestant writers, but refer you to the history of *Tbuanus*, president of the parliament of *Paris*, and a Papist. The third instance I shall give you, is the murder of the *Albigenses* and *Waldenses*, under the Crusade from the Pope; in the execution of which *Simon Mouniford* had the principal hand; and there was in it 150,000 poor innocent people murdered, under no other pretence, but that they did not own some of the doctrines of the church of Rome, particularly the infallibility of that church, and that after a few Latin words pronounced by a priest, the wafer and wine in the sacrament were turned into the body and blood

of our Saviour. In this case the Roman Catholics themselves are ashamed of that cruelty, as there is no pretence for saying they were rebels to any government, but were a quiet, inoffensive people, like the *Gentoos* in India, or the *Quakers* here.

The fourth instance I shall give, is the massacre in *Ireland* in 1641; in which about one hundred thousand people, men, women and children, were murdered in cold blood in that kingdom: and had it not been for the discovery made by one man, to the lords justices of that kingdom, all the protestant inhabitants of *Dublin* had suffered the same fate. Indeed it is needless to give instances to persuade any body of this doctrine and practice of the Roman Catholics, for the act of parliament *De heretico comburendo*, is known to every body; and their practice was agreeable to that act of parliament, of which the history of England furnishes innumerable examples. The church of England and the Presbyterians have sometimes kick'd and cuff'd one another, but never cut one another's throats.

You next observe the wisdom of parliament in beginning a reformation in the Catholick church of *Canada*, and extending these Canadians who
are

are willing to support the king's authority, on the back of the rebellious subjects of *Boston*.

If you had said, that the wisdom of parliament had preferred the Roman Catholick religion in *Canada*, to that of the church of England, you would have been nearer the truth: But indeed you are in the right to think, that these French Papists in *Canada* will with pleasure support the king's authority, if it is applied to the destruction of our protestant brethren in *Boston*. But I hope never to see a protestant prince of the House of *Hanover*, so deluded as to apply his authority to the destruction of his protestant subjects, in favour of French Papists, who wish to ruin him and the Protestant religion. But I shall not repeat what I have said before on the *Quebec* act of parliament.

You next observe, that during this reign, there never has been an attempt on the liberties of the subjects. In this I can't agree with you, for I think the *general warrants* was a most open attempt against our liberties; tho' I am far from thinking that our sovereign concurred in it. Had the General Warrants been found to be legal, we should next day been greater slaves than they are in *France*. I was long at *Paris* when

Lord

Lord *Stairs* was ambassador there ; and, as I said before, I never saw a General Warrant entrusted with a messenger or officer of justice ; all warrants being against particular persons ; for the great officers of the crown reserved to themselves to judge against whom a warrant is to be executed. To trust a messenger with a General Warrant, is to trust him with the liberties and properties of mankind in general, as he may execute them against either one or two, or one or two hundred, as he pleases. All the excuse he needs to make for seizing your person and papers, is, that he suspects you guilty of such a thing. I know it will be said, that General Warrants were in practice in other reigns, and under other ministers. It is true : but it never entered into the head of any minister before, to pretend that these warrants were legal. They were only granted when absolute necessity required it, for the preservation of the state, as press warrants for sailors are granted : and if any damage was done to any private person by them, reparation was made them. But here, these General Warrants were publicly supported by the money of the Treasury, as legal : and my Lord *Cambden*, then lord chief justice of the
Common

Common Pleas, deserved a statue of gold to be erected to him for rejecting them as illegal.

You next advance a very extraordinary doctrine, viz. that the Jesuits are by no comparison of better principles than the sectaries.

This deserves no answer, as such an assertion will have no effect upon any Protestant who knows the principles of his brethren. It is an undoubted fact, and well attested by all history, that all the edicts and persecutions against the Protestants, since the Reformation, have taken their rise from that society. When I was abroad, the famous Mr. *De Pin*, doctor of the *Sorbonne*, and all the moderate Roman Catholicks, owned to me, that they were the disturbers of the peace of Christendom, and had no religion but their interest: and now, I am glad to find, most of the Popish princes of Christendom think of them as Mr. *De Pin* did.

You conclude with these words—Exert, my countrymen, your loyalty to the best of kings, and to the constitution. In this conclusion, I, and I hope all good Protestants, will agree with you: for every man who really loves the king, must be sensible, that the preservation of the constitution, and the liberties of *Great Britain*,
are

are equally the interest of his Majesty and of his family, as they are of his subjects. And any person who wants to extend his prerogative beyond its legal bounds, is an enemy to the royal family, let him pretend what he will. I spent good part of a winter, and most of a summer, at *Hanover*, at two different times, with that amiable prince, the late Prince of *Wales*, who justly deserved the character given to *Titus* the Roman emperor, *Deliciæ humani generis*. There never was a better heart in a human breast, than he possessed; and he often said to me, that if he lived to be king of *Britain*, he would look upon any man, who wished to see him an absolute prince, as an enemy to him and his family, for two reasons: first, Because the preservation of the liberties and religion of *Great Britain* were the causes of establishing his family on the throne. Secondly, Because he was convinced, that the king of a free people was twice as powerful as a king of slaves to his arbitrary will.

As you seem, in this performance, to wish to have your pension augmented, I think you take the wrong way to bring that about, by aspersing the memory of that great prince, King William,
and

and representing the Presbyterians as traitors, and enemies to the royal family. Is it not notorious, that Europe owes its preservation from French slavery to that great hero? Is it not equally notorious, that to him the Revolution is owing, by which we were preserved from popery and slavery; and that to him we owe the fixing the present royal family on the throne.

You represent the Presbyterians as the authors of the death of Charles the first. The least knowledge in history, will convince any man to the contrary. It is true, the Presbyterians opposed King Charles the first in his attempts to introduce arbitrary power, and to levy taxes without the consent of parliament; but were so far from having any hand in the king's death, that *Oliver Cromwell*, who brought it about, turned the Presbyterians out of the House of Commons. And the Scotch Presbyterians, who had joined the English parliament, to prevent the king's enslaving the nation, sent an army of 20,000 men to relieve him from the hands of *Cromwell*, who beat them at *Preston*. And it was to the Presbyterians, in the parliament 1660, that king Charles the second owed his restoration. It was to the Presbyterians, in a great measure,

measure, the Revolution was owing, by which the settlement of the crown on the present royal family was fixed. Pray, Sir, who were the rebels in *Scotland* in the year 1715—were they not all either Papists or Episcopalists—was there any Presbyterians among them? And did not the Presbyterians join heartily in assisting the regular forces of the government against them? I myself, tho' then very young, raised and commanded a company of 52 volunteers, furnished them with necessaries, and put ourselves under the command of his Grace the Duke of *Argyle* during that campaign—by which I am this moment out of pocket 2000 *l*. And in the rebellion 1745, the Presbyterians were equally zealous in support of government. And every body knows, that the late Duke of *Cumberland*, acquainted his Majesty, that the Presbyterians were his only friends in Scotland, and that the Episcopalists were his enemies; and as such he caused shut up their meetings, as nurseries of rebellion. And at this present time, are there any Presbyterians in those meetings where non-juring ministers preach—No, Sir, they are to a man Episcopalists.

If

If these things are matters of fact, how can you imagine to make your court to his Majesty and his ministers, by aspersing the memory of King William, the author of the Protestant succession in this Majesty's family; and misrepresenting the Presbyterians, and other Protestant Dissenters, as enemies to the royal family, when the contrary is so notoriously known, and that they are, to a man, the chief supporters of his Majesty and his family. It would seem you are one of those, who asperse the present ministry, as being enemies to the interest of their master and his family—and, if that was the case, you would judge right, for aspersions against King William, and the Presbyterians, and other Protestant Dissenters, would be agreeably to them: and, indeed, I cannot reconcile the pains you have taken to shew so much spleen against King William, and the Protestant Dissenters, to any other cause; for, if you suppose his Majesty's ministers friends to his friends, it would not be rational in you to make your court to them by declaring war against their best friends.

I submit these observations to your perusal, and I assure you, I have no personal ill-will to you, and have no view of interest in what I have

H

said.

said. I never had sixpence from the government for venturing my life and estate for their service; besides throwing out so much money, in maintaining a company of Volunteers to serve them; which, including the interest of the money, is now more than 2000*l.* It is true, I was made judge in the Court of Admiralty of *Ireland*, on the recommendation of the late Lord *Stairs*; but as I had no salary, I was a loser by it—it was a place of honour, and took up so much of my attention, that I lost more than I gained, by employing my time there, which I could have employed as an advocate in the other courts: and at last, after possessing it for about 13 years, I was deprived of it in favour of a member of parliament, who, being in opposition to the court, was thought necessary to be gained over, and who had a salary annexed to it, as I was told.

I believe people owe their principles, in a great measure, to their education when young: my predecessors fought against King Charles I. at the beginning of the civil war, and was amongst those afterwards who endeavoured to save him, at the battle of *Preston*, and fought against *Cromwell*, and was in *Monk's* plot, for restor-

restoring King Charles the second, and as members of the convention in Scotland, supported King William—and as I have been bred up in the principles of liberty, I shall die in these principles—a lover of the constitution, and the Protestant religion, and expect neither post nor pension for being so. Sincerely do I wish, that his Majesty may employ none about him, but his real friends, whose families have distinguished themselves as friends to his family; being of opinion with that great man, the Duke of *Sully*, who said to King Henry the fourth of France, *It may be sometimes necessary for you, Sir, to give pensions to those families who have been your enemies, but never put it in their power to hurt you, by giving them employments of trust in the state, where they have it in their power to betray your interests.*

There were three æra's which distinguished the friends of the House of *Hanover* from its enemies; the first was, when the act of settlement was made; the second was, when the Tory and Jacobite ministry, in the latter end of Queen Anne's reign, intended to overturn that settlement; and the third was the rebellion in 1715. His Majesty may very easily find out those families

lies

lies who were for or against his family in those times.

I hope God Almighty will direct his Majesty at this critical time, to follow such measures as to prevent the loss of America, as by that we must lose ourselves, by the loss of our trade and manufactures: and I hope, the wisdom of the present parliament, by treating the late acts of parliament, with regard to America, as the *Jews* act was treated, will save the nation from ruin, by supporting the only thing, that can make us a great and powerful people,

I assure you, Sir, I had no view, in writing this letter, to advance any thing that I thought could disoblige you; all that I wanted was to correct some mistakes of yours with regard to King William, the Protestant Dissenters, the royal family, and the Church of Rome. I looked upon the Protestant succession, as what alone could save this country from popery and slavery; and therefore ventured my life and estate, in my early years, against the rebels in 1715; and am out of pocket more than 2000*l.* by doing what I apprehended to be my duty, and never had sixpence in return in any shape whatever, all I wish for is, to see his Majesty directed to such

such measures as are most proper to preserve the affections of his subjects both here and in America, to him and his family: and I am afraid, that their affections may be greatly hurt and lessened by the late acts of parliament with regard to America. It is the misfortune of Princes often to be surrounded with pretended friends instead of real ones, who are willing to share profitable employments among them, as long as they can insinuate themselves into their sovereign's favour; but when he is brought into difficulties, perhaps by following their advice, they will be the first to desert him. I hope his Majesty has none but real friends about him.

What alarms me much in the present situation of our affairs, is this, we seem to neglect the alliance made by King William with the Emperor, as the only security against the encroachments of France; and we seem to court and depend on the friendship of France. My Lord *Stairs*, my relation, had always the same opinion of French faith in treaties that the Romans had of the *Punica fides*. The French are now powerful at sea; and their riches, by the West India trade, greatly increased: and if we break with North America, and lose our trade
and

and nursery of sailors——don't we run the risk of their taking the advantage of this, and taking possession of that trade and country, and perhaps of Great Britain itself: for I was always taught, by that great man, Lord *Stairs*, to believe, that France was the only nation we had reason to fear.

HUGH BAILLIE.

fk
ng
rr-
ys
e-
ad

